

## REMARKS

The Office Action of December 6, 1996, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Kübler, et al. in view of the patent to Fantoni, et al. in view of the patent to Johnson.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kübler, et al. in view of Fantoni, et al. and Johnson, and further in view of the patent to Fromson, et al. and the patent to Gerhardt.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kübler, et al. in view of Fantoni, et al. and Johnson, and further in view of the patent to Tittgemeyer.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kübler, et al. in view of Fantoni, et al. and Johnson, and further in view of Tittgemeyer, the patent to Kühn, et al. and the patent to Morgan.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kübler, et al. in view of Fantoni, et al. and Johnson, and further in view of each of Kühn, et al., Tittgemeyer and Gerhardt.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kübler, et al. in view of Fantoni, et al. and Johnson, and further in view of each of Kühn, et al., the patent to Lewis and the patent Berna, et al.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kübler, et al. in view of Johnson and Fantoni, et al.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kübler, et al. in view of Johnson and Fantoni, et al. and further in view of the patent to Dekumbis, et al.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kübler, et al. in view of Fantoni, et al., Johnson, Fromson, et al. and Gerhardt.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kübler, et al. in view of Fantoni, et al., Kühn, et al., Morgan and Johnson.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kübler, et al. in view of Johnson, Fantoni, et al. and each of Kühn, et al., Tittgemeyer and Gerhardt.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kübler, et al. in view of Johnson, Fantoni, et al., Fadner, et al., Morgan and the patent to Jenkins.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 12, 14, 16 and 17. The claims have been amended to more clearly bring forth that the weld seam is of a metal material so that after processing the surface of the sleeve, including the weld seam is a homogenous, continuous and uniform circumferential metal surface which makes continuous printing possible. It is respectfully submitted that these changes do not raise new issues which have not been previously before the Examiner. These changes only are believed to help bring out the inventive nature of the claims.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims now on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the methods and constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references, and particularly to the patent to Kübler, et al., this reference has been discussed in detail in the last filed amendment. As was pointed out then there is no disclosure of a homogenous, continuous and uniform circumferential metal surface formed by processing the surface end of the weld seam, as in the presently claimed invention.

The patent to Fantoni, et al. discloses a method for mechanically joining the marginal portions of a blank of a printing plate for rotary printing. This reference teaches a sleeve in which the ends of the plate are connected together by a form-locking connection. In the groove formed at the joint between the ends of the plate there is a hardenable material that can be removed after the printing plate is used so that the printing plate can be disconnected at its ends and laid flat again. Fantoni, et al. do not disclose a homogenous, continuous and uniform outer circumferential metal surface that includes the metal weld seam and is formed by processing the surface and the weld seam, as in the presently claimed invention. The material 8 used to fill the groove of Fantoni, et al. does not conform with the photosensitive layer 5. Thus, as with the sleeve of Kübler, et al., the sleeve of Fantoni, et al. does not appear to permit continuous printing, as in the presently claimed invention.

The patent to Johnson discloses a cylindrical member and a method for making the same. The Johnson cylinder member is comprised of a cylinder member 10 having a groove 11 running longitudinally therein, a metal sheet wrapped around the cylindrical member 10 so that the ends of the metal sheet are bent downward into the groove 11. A welding material is then applied to fill the groove and to anchor the sheet to the cylinder. Johnson does not disclose a metal carrying sleeve consisting essentially of a metal sheet that has its ends welded together and whose surface, including the weld seam is processed to provide a homogenous, continuous and uniform outer metallic surface which permits continuous printing, as in the presently claimed invention.

The Examiner combined these references in determining that claims 1, 2 and 8 would be unpatentable over such a combination. It is respectfully submitted that a combination

of these references does not teach a metal carrying sleeve consisting essentially of a thin-walled flat metal sheet that is bent to a cylindrical form, a metal weld seam to permanently connect together the edges, and a homogenous, continuous and uniform outer circumferential metal surface, including the metal weld seam and formed by processing the surface and the weld seam so that continuous printing is possible, as in the presently claimed invention. A combination of references also does not teach a method as recited in claim 8 for producing such a carrying sleeve.

In view of these considerations, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Fromson, et al. discloses a process for graining an aluminum base lithographic plate. This reference provides no teachings regarding a process for producing an offset printing form as recited in independent claim 12.

The patent to Gerhardt discloses a process for producing an embossing dye in a roll form. This reference also provides absolutely no teaching regarding a process for producing an offset printing form in which a weld seam in a welded metal carrying sleeve is worked to produce a homogenous, continuous and uniform outer circumferential surface, as in the presently claimed invention.

The Examiner combined Gerhardt and Fromson, et al. with Kübler, et al., Fantoni, et al. and Johnson in determining that claims 12 and 13 are unpatentable over such a combination. It is respectfully submitted that for the reasons given above in connection with the rejections of claims 1 and 8, Kübler, et al., Fantoni, et al. and Johnson do not teach the basic

present invention as claimed. The additional teachings of Fromson and Gerhardt when taken in combination with the other references do not add anything which suggests the process as defined in independent claim 12. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Kühn, et al. and Morgan disclose the placement of a conventional engraved copper coat on a printing roller. The Examiner combined these references with Kübler, et al., Fantoni, et al. and Johnson in determining that claim 14 would be unpatentable over such a combination. It is respectfully submitted that the additional teachings of Kühn, et al. and Morgan do not supplement the teachings of Kübler, et al., Fantoni, et al. and Johnson so as to teach the presently claimed invention as discussed previously in connection with claims 1 and 8, and as presently defined in claim 14. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Tittgemeyer discloses a method and apparatus for printing with a lithographic sleeve. Although Tittgemeyer discloses a water conducting coat on the outer surface of a printing roller, when this reference is combined with Kübler, et al., Johnson, Fantoni, et al., Kühn, et al. and Gerhardt it is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion for a process for producing a transfer form, as recited in independent claim 17. It is respectfully submitted that the sheer number of references relied upon by the Examiner (six), is strong evidence that the presently claimed invention is not obvious. It clearly appears that the

Examiner has selectively chosen components from each of these references based upon the teachings of the present application to arrive at the presently claimed invention.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Fadner, et al. discloses a variable-delivery ink metering method, system and roller for keyless lithography. Jenkins discloses a process for producing a coated thin-walled cylinder. The Examiner combined the teachings of these references with Kübler, et al., Johnson, Fantoni, et al. and Morgan in determining that claim 17 is unpatentable over such a combination. Once again it is respectfully submitted that the large number of references (again six) is indicative of the nonobviousness of the presently claimed invention. There is nothing in the teachings of these references which would suggest the combination of the features as selected by the Examiner, without having the present application as a guide. However, even if combinable these references do not teach the presently claimed process for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claims 1 and 8.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

As for the references which were cited against the dependent claims in combination with the previously discussed references, these have also been considered. Since they do not come close to the currently claimed subject matter than the references discussed above it is believed that any detailed comments thereon would be superfluous. Thus, it is

respectfully submitted that the various rejections of the dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are overcome and should be withdrawn.


It is respectfully submitted that the present matter places the application in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with the application may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By   
Klaus P. Stoffel  
Reg. No. 31,668  
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210  
New York, New York 10176  
(212) 687-2770

Dated: March 6, 1997